



MINUTE SUMMARY
Regular Meeting of the Edina Planning Commission
Wednesday, September 30, 2009, 7:00 PM
Edina City Hall Council Chambers
4801 50th Street West

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Mike Fischer, Jeff Carpenter, Kevin Staunton, Michael Schroeder, Steve Brown, Floyd Grabel, Arlene Forrest and Karwehn Kata

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Nancy Scherer and Julie Risser

STAFF PRESENT:

Cary Teague and Jackie Hoogenakker

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

The minutes of the September 2, 2009, meeting were filed as submitted.

Chair Fischer welcomed Karwehn Kata, new student member to the Commission. Mr. Kata is a junior at Edina High School.

II. NEW BUSINESS:

2009.0004.09d David Werner
6875 Washington Avenue, Edina

Request: Amend Zoning Ordinance 850

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission that David Werner has requested that the City of Edina amend its Zoning Ordinance to allow automobile service centers in the Planned Industrial District (PID). Planner Teague explained that currently the Zoning Ordinance only allows automobile service centers in the

Planned Commercial District-4 (PCD-4). Automobile service centers are not allowed in the PID.

The applicant would like to locate an automobile service center business at 6875 Washington Avenue, which is a property zoned PID. The PCD-4 Zoning District was created as an area specifically to allow automotive service centers. However, when the PID was created it did not include automobile service center as a use that would be allowed.

Planner Teague explained that after considering the request staff believes the Planning Commission has the following four options to consider while proceeding with the proposed Ordinance amendment:

1. Deny the proposal as requested, as auto repair would not be consistent with the uses within the PID, Planned Industrial District.
2. Recommend approval of the attached ordinance that would make auto repair a permitted use within the PID, Planned Industrial District.
If approved, this alternative would require Planning Commission, Transportation Commission and City Council review if a building on a site is torn down and replaced, or if there would be a 10% expansion to an existing building. If a building is simply remodeled for the use, staff review would be required. An example would be the recent review for Murphy Automotive at 70th and Cahill, where the existing building was torn down and rebuilt, and the project received full Commission and Council review.
3. Recommend approval of the attached ordinance that would make auto repair a conditionally permitted use. Planning Commission, Transportation Commission and City Council review would be required for any introduction of this use on a site.
4. Table the request for additional information.

Concluding Planner Teague stated staff would recommend allowing auto repair in the PID, as a permitted use similar to the PCD-4 District, with the added conditions that would be required for all auto repair uses, and not establishing minimum or maximum lot sizes in the industrial district. Planner Teague added that should the Planning Commission recommend that a Conditional Use Permit be required, staff would recommend that a Conditional Use Permit also be required for these uses within the PCD-4 District.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Grabiell asked Planner Teague his reasoning for supporting option three vs. option four. Planner Teague responded that automobile service centers are permitted uses in the PCD-4 zoning district and allowing them as a permitted use in the PID zoning district would make sense because the intensity of an automobile service center matches the intensity of many other permitted industrial uses. Planner Teague concluded he would have no problem

supporting the amendment as a conditional use if the Commission deems that more appropriate.

The discussion continued with Commissioners clarifying and raising the following:

- It was acknowledged that within the City there is limited opportunity to add additional PCD-4 zoning districts.
- Permitted Principle and Accessory use vs. Conditional Use:

Commissioners discussed the merits of amending the ordinance to allow automobile service centers as a permitted use, either as principle or accessory. Commissioners expressed unease at “going this route”. Commissioners pointed out that if automobile service centers were a permitted use the entire PID zoning district would be impacted, and there would be no Commission or Council review unless the building were razed or expanded as previously mentioned by staff. If it were permitted as a Conditional Use every request would be reviewed.

A number of Commissioners indicated they could support an amendment to the code that would allow automobile repair as a conditionally permitted use. This change would be more site specific and require review at both Commission and Council levels.

- Rezone the site:

It was mentioned since the City already has a zoning classification for this type of land use that industrial sites (where appropriate) could be rezoned to PCD-4. It was also observed that there are differences within the PCD-4 zoning designation itself – straight automobile services or gas stations with services, pointing out that these differences could impact internal traffic flow especially if the rezoning was for gas and services. Commissioners also acknowledged if a site were rezoned to PCD-4 on a multi-tenant site difficulties could arise. Commissioners indicated rezoning an industrial site to PCD-4 would not be an option they would readily consider.

The discussion continued with Commissioners expressing the opinion that it appears that once again the Commission is reacting to a specific request from a property owner to amend the code. Amending the code during the zoning ordinance update process may not be in the best interest of the City.

Commission Action

Commissioner Brown moved denial of the requested ordinance amendment based on the broad sweeping impact the request would have on the PID zoning district. Commissioner Grabiell seconded the motion. Ayes, Schroeder, Brown, Grabiell, Forrest. Nay; Carpenter, Staunton, Fischer. Request denied 4-3.

III. OTHER BUSINESS:

Small Area Plans

Planner Presentation

Chair Fischer asked the Commission to recall a previous ordinance amendment request (located in the Valley View/Wooddale neighborhood) that would allow the continued use of an existing pharmacy drive-thru for a proposed restaurant/coffee shop use. Chair Fischer noted at that time concern was expressed that in "real time" it was very difficult to act on a request in a neighborhood that has been identified as needing a small area plan. Continuing, Chair Fischer said he approached Commissioner Schroeder and asked him to formulate a draft on a process for a small area plan that would be community-based. Concluding, Chair Fischer said he and Commissioner Schroeder felt that a good project to initiate this "process" would be the new public works facility.

Commissioner Schroeder addressed the Commission and explained that as a direct result of past meetings it was found that residents had indicated that they want more involvement in the development of small area plans. Commissioner Schroeder said the purpose of this outline/guide would be to align people around an idea and quickly (4+ weeks) formulate a plan to follow when reviewing a small area plan. This "plan" would be created by a citizen committee as a guide, adding it could be considered the start of the formal plan. Commissioner Schroeder outlined 12 activities for the process; 1) "kick-off" meeting 2) Coordination meeting 3) Site investigation 4) Developer roundtable 5) Site tour 6) Focus group session 7) Community meeting 8) Design charrette 9) Open house 10) Refinement charrette 11) Planning Commission 12) City Council. The process also contains an involvement process with four components: 1) Technical Advisory Group/TAC which consists of City staff and other agency representatives. 2) Community Advisory Team/CAT which would consist of a team leader, and members of the planning and transportation commissions, representative from the Emergency and Environment Commission and community representatives (property owners, business owners, etc). 3) Design Team consisting of a team leader, architects, landscape architects,

planners, transportation experts, market/real estate specialists etc. and lastly, 4) Public.

Chair Fischer said he envisions the need for this “process” to be tested out; reiterating in his opinion a good “project” to test this process may be with the new public works facility. Chair Fischer stated he has had discussions with the Mayor, Mr. Hughes and Ms. Worthington on this concept and the “testing” of this plan on the public works facility could conceptually happen in February

A discussion ensued regarding the small area plan process and outline with the following comments from the Commission:

- The quick process can be envisioned for the Morningside/44th, Wooddale/Valley View, and 70th & Cahill areas - but with larger areas such as 50th & France and the greater Southdale area it may take much longer to develop the right plan –
- The proposed plan is being proactive and gives both the developers and residents guidance
- An important detail would be the composition of the “community advisory team” – the makeup of the “team” lends credibility to the process
- The Planning Commission should have more involvement (right from the start) with the development of small area plans, not at the end
- How does one select residents for the community advisory team (?) – the team should be non-political – It is also important when a small area plan is being reviewed to keep the entire community in mind, not only those that live in close proximity to the “small area” under consideration – while their input is very important care must be given to the process and how residents that don’t attend the meetings are represented. The City doesn’t want those residents disenfranchised. It was acknowledged that this was a good point and when choosing a “team” make sure there are geographical representatives from the entire City, north, south, east, and west.
- Flexibility – could this be the bridge between the Comp Plan and Zoning Ordinance
- Understand that while small area plans are being studied an application to develop/redevelop in one of the areas could be submitted to the City
- Acknowledge that if a small area plan isn’t finalized or adopted the City would have little standing in preventing development/redevelopment unless the plan has been formally recognized as conceptual; however, if the redevelopment proposal meets code there still may be little the City could do to prevent development/redevelopment

Concluding, Chair Fischer said in his opinion it is important to test ideas and bring those small area plan ideas to the development community when and if a proposal comes forward in one of the small areas identified in the Comp Plan.

Chair Fischer added it also gives the City an opportunity to use the talents of its residents. Chair Fischer said if this Community-based planning process for a Small Area Plan is given the “green light” on the new public works facility the process would begin in February. Chair Fischer thanked everyone for their input, adding no action needs to be taken.

IV. COMMUNITY COMMENT:

None

V. INTERGOVERNMENTAL BUSINESS:

Chair Fischer informed the Commission the Zoning Ordinance Update Committee will meet with the public on Wednesday, October 14, 2009, at 7:00 pm in the Fireside Room at the Edina Senior Center.

Chair Fischer acknowledged receipt of the “back of packet” materials.

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE: October 28, 2009

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Carpenter moved adjournment at 8:05 pm. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion to adjourn carried.

Submitted by